

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/771,245	RIGHI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	JAMES RUTTEN	2192	

**All Participants:**

(1) JAMES RUTTEN.

(2) Steven Koon Hon Wong, Reg. No. 48,459.

**Status of Application:** Allowable

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 21 August 2008

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Double Patenting*

Claims discussed:

*1-3, 6-15 and 32*

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/J. Derek Rutten/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2192

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Mr. Rutten called Mr. Wong to discuss the double patenting rejection. Mr. Rutten indicated that the claims were allowable over the prior art, but that a remaining double patenting rejection stood in the way of an allowance. Mr. Wong agreed to consider filing a terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejection.